

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/961,086	ROSS ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Susan Ungar	1642	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Susan Ungar. (3) _____

(2) Drew hissong. (4) _____

Date of Interview: 28 June 2007.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: N/A.

Identification of prior art discussed: N/A.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Discussed the substitute CRF submitted on January 15, 2002 which was found by STIC to be damaged and unreadable. It appears that no notice was sent to Applicant regarding the problem with the CRF. Upon request of a sequence search by Examiner, STIC indicated to Examiner that a new CRF was needed for the search. It is noted that SEQ ID NO:1 had previously been searched and examined on the basis of the search of the CRF submitted on 9/21/2001. In the interests of compact prosecution, the instant invention drawn to antibody binding to a polypeptide comprising SEQ ID NO:1 amino acids 79 to 86 is being searched with the CFR submitted 9/21/01 because a review of the previous search of SEQ ID NO:1 reveals that amino acids 79 to 86 of the SEQ ID NO:1 submitted 9/21/01 is identical to amino acids 79 to 86 of Figure 2A. Further, given the identity of amino acids 79 to 86 of SEQ ID NO:1, it will be assumed for examination purposes, unless found to be otherwise, that the original search of SEQ ID NO:1 using the CRF submitted on 9/21/2001 is valid. Applicant will submit a substitute CRF and the appropriate assurances in response to Examiner's request.